REMARKS

Claim amendments:

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 15-16 were previously cancelled.

Claims 4 and 8-13 have been indicated as being allowable and are not amended in this response.

Claim 14 has been amended as indicated below.

Claims 17 and 18 are not amended in this response.

Claims 14 and 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of DEVRIES or UNO. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 14 has been amended to emphasize the mobile nature of the paper shredding operation, and the fact that the spraying of fire suppression liquid occurs during shredding.

Both DEVRIES and UNO are irrelevant because they do not deal with mobile truck mounted shredders. In the art of mobile truck mounted shredders, it is known to use fire extinguishing systems that are available to inject fluid into a paper shredding compartment upon detection of a fire, much like the systems found in office buildings. The applicant does not have a reference that describes such usage. What is novel in the present application is the spraying of water to keep dust down during shredding to avoid a fire in the first place. There is also the added advantage that dust reduction makes the resulting shredded paper more acceptable to recycling operations.

With regard to claim 14 and claim 17 in view of APA and DEVRIES, DEVRIES teaches a particular droplet size for use in treating municipal solid waste

that may contain flammable materials. The droplet size is intended to avoid absorption on surfaces (col. 3, lines 15-36). While some dust remove does occur (col. 6, lines 23-27), the removal is incidental and the intention seems to be to maximize the survival rate of the water droplet through the equipment (see claim 1 of DEVRIES). The intended fire suppression mechanism is by quenching, rather than removal of dust (for example, col. 5, lines 45-49). Hence, DEVRIES teaches away from the claimed invention. Hence, combination of the references does not establish a *prime facie* case for obviousness.

DEVRIES approaches a different problem, namely flammable materials in municipal waste, such as alcohol, gasoline, paint or paint solvents (col. 1, line 28). The examiner incorrectly argues that the type of fluid used would have been an obvious design choice only based on several factors such as material being treated and desired results of the fluid material. DEVRIES considers the incidental removal of dust (col. 6, lines 23-27) and mentions that municipal waste contains a major portion of paper (col. 1, line 24) but does not suggest that a different type of fluid would be more effective. Therefore, since DEVRIES has considered the removal of dust and the treatment of paper, a change in material does not suggest that it is obvious to change the type of fluid being used. Moreover, the combination of DEVRIES and APA does not yield the invention since DEVRIES teaches survival of the fine mist, while the present invention removes dust from the air with the water spray. Thus DEVRIES teaches away from the claimed invention. Hence, combination of the references does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

With regard to claim 14 and claim 17 in view of APA and UNO, UNO does not deal with fire hazard reduction in mobile paper shredders, as UNO deals with explosive materials in garbage disposal. The examiner argues that the type of fluid used would have been an obvious design choice only based on several factors such as material being treated and desired results of the fluid. However, UNO proposes a different solution, namely steam used to reduce oxygen inside a crusher. UNO does not teach use of liquid or removal of dust as a fire suppression technique. The

examiner has not correctly shown that to look at UNO, or municipal waste art in general, shows a useful solution. Thus the examiner does not show that combination of UNO with APA teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Hence, combination of the references does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of DEVRIES or UNO. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

With regards to claim 18 in view of APA and DEVRIES, neither DEVRIES nor APA teach or suggest a liquid feed rate of about 1 gallon per minute for each 6000 lbs of paper shredded per hour. The examiner failed to identify how the prior art teaches or suggests a liquid feed rate of about 1 gallon per minute for each 6000 lbs of paper. Hence, combination of the references does not provide a *prime facie* case of obviousness.

Respectfully submitted and signed on

Oct. 20/06

(Date)

Tony Lambert

ANTHONY R LAMBERT
Registration No. 32,813
Customer no. 020212
Telephone: (780) 448-7326

AGENT OF RECORD